

Serial No. 10/775,658

Amendment to Office Action dated December 30, 2005

Amendment dated March 30, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 9-11 and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kakekado et al. (USPN 6,359,746), hereinafter Kakekado. Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakekado in view of Hampshire (USPN 5,329,409).

Applicants respectfully submit the cited references do not teach, suggest or disclose “[a]n apparatus, comprising: *a current measurement device*; a head gimbal assembly including a head to at least one of read and write information signals from/to a moving storage medium, *said current measurement device electrically coupled* to said head and said storage medium; and said current measurement device is to *measure current* between said head and said storage medium” (e.g., as described in claim 1).

As to claim 1, the Office Action asserts Col. 7 lines 19-21 and 23-37 of Kakekado shows the recited current measurement device. See Office Action dated 12/30/2005, page 2, paragraph 2. Applicants disagree. As argued previously, a review of this section reveals that a *voltage application means* is provided to *apply voltage* so as to control the voltage potential difference between the magnetic disk and the magnetic head slider. Though current and voltage can be directly proportional, a voltage application means cannot be considered a current measurement device. It is noted that Figs. 15 and 21-22 all refer to a voltage generating circuit 108 as an example of the voltage application means. The text cited in the Office Action also refers to a “detection means.” See column 6, line 46. However, as seen in Col. 7, lines 6-11, the detection means includes an *acceleration* detector and some sort of detection *for the roughness* of the magnetic disk. Nowhere in Kakekado does it suggest that such detection means could be used as

Serial No. 10/775,658

Amendment to Office Action dated December 30, 2005

Amendment dated March 30, 2006

a current measurement device *or* a voltage measurement device.

The recent Office Action further asserts that the reference teaches a detection means for potential difference detection, and hence a change in voltage as well as in current is occurring and is being detected (citing columns 6-7). *See* page 6, paragraph 6. Applicants again disagree, and submit that the cited reference does not teach a *detection* means for potential difference (as asserted by the Office Action), but rather a potential difference *application* device. As argued above, *application* is not the equivalent *detection*, and application certainly does not equal *measurement*. Kakekado does not teach or describe voltage detection or measurement. Moreover, Applicants submit that nowhere in the extensive cited section of “columns 6-7” is the description of the use of a detection means or a measurement means for *current*. The Office Action’s assertion that a change in voltage as well as in current is occurring *and is being detected* is erroneous and unsupported by the Kakekado reference.

In the same paragraph, the Office Action directs Applicants to reference numeral 108 and its disclosure. As argued above, Kakekado does not describe the “voltage *generating* circuit” 108 (*emphasis added*) as having the ability to *measure* voltage, and element 108 definitely is not the equivalent of a “current measurement device” as specifically recited in claimed embodiments of the present application.

In order to support a proper §102(b) rejection, the Kakekado reference must describe each and every limitation of claim 1, including at least a “current measure device”. Since it does not, Applicants submit that the Kakekado reference is inadequate to support a proper §102(b) rejection, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Hampshire does not make up for the deficiencies of Kakekado in that Hampshire is

Serial No. 10/775,658
Amendment to Office Action dated December 30, 2005
Amendment dated March 30, 2006

concerned with compensating for offset in the actuator current of the servo system of a disc drive. Hampshire discloses the sensing of actuator current and has nothing at all to do with sensing current between a head and a storage medium as recited in the claims.

Therefore, since none of the cited references teach, suggest or describe each and every limitation of claim 1, the current rejection is inadequate and should be withdrawn, and claim 1 should be allowed. Independent claims 3, 9 and 15-17 contain similar allowable subject matter, and therefore are allowable as well. Claims 2, 4-8 and 9-14 are allowable for depending from allowable base claims.

The Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: March 30, 2006

By: 

Sumit Bhattacharya
Reg. No. 51,469

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos Street, Suite 600
San Jose, California 95110
(408) 975-7500 telephone
(408) 975-7501 facsimile

84040.1

- 8 -